

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 22

Whereas the Federal income tax and numerous other taxes levied by the Federal Government have not only imposed a heavy burden upon the American taxpayer but, by funneling into the Federal Treasury many of the prime potential sources of State revenue, have had a depressing effect upon each of the 50 sovereign States; and

Whereas the Federal Government now takes in Federal taxes from the State of Illinois approximately \$7 billion annually, and takes a proportionate amount from each of the other States; and

Whereas for many years State and local governments have been in a straitened financial condition which constitutes a real emergency which has been compounded by the impact of Federal taxation; and

Whereas this emergency could be alleviated if the several States were given their rightful share of the total tax revenues by a system whereby the Government of the United States would refund to each State 10 percent of the Federal taxes collected therein without curtailing or interfering with any present or future program of Federal and State functions; and

Whereas since these tax funds are the taxes from the people, this refund is not to be considered a Federal loan or gift or any form of Federal aid nor will the use of these funds be restricted; Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein*, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a refund to each State of 10 percent of all Federal taxes collected therein without any restriction on the use of such refunds; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to every Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois, and to the Governor and the secretary of state of each of the other 49 States.

Adopted by the senate, April 14, 1965.

Senate concurred in house amendment June 9, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,  
*President of the Senate.*  
 EDWARD E. FERNANDES,  
*Secretary of the Senate.*

Concurred in by the house of representatives, June 8, 1965, as amended.

JOHN P. TOWHY,  
*Speaker of House of Representatives.*  
 CHARLES F. KERVIM,  
*Clerk of House of Representatives.*

This resolution was offered by State Senators Broyles, John A. Graham, Kerr, Gottschalk, Davis, Arrington, Sours, Drach, Peters, Fawell, Harris, Ozinga, Gilbert, Laughlin, Martin, Rosander, Merritt, Hatch, Peterson, Mitchler, Lanigan, Swanson, Latherow, Carpenter, Sprague Hoffelder, Collins, Hart, William Lyons, Grindle, Larson, Paul Graham, and Groen.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution dramatically states the progressive recommendation of leading members of the Illinois State Senate in a constitutional step that would produce proper balance in our Government and give the States an opportunity to fill their proper role in the challenges of the day. States and local communities can far more effectively cope with the problems within their borders than we can, operating at a distance in Washington. This resolution, incidentally, was adopted and was adopted unanimously by the Illinois State Senate.

FEDERAL CRIME TO ASSASSINATE PRESIDENT

(Mr. SCHWEIKER (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, as the original sponsor in the last Congress of legislation making it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President, I strongly support passage of H.R. 6097.

Some 30 of our colleagues joined me in the 88th Congress in introducing identical and similar measures to H.R. 9232 which I proposed following President Kennedy's tragic assassination. Subsequently the Warren Commission recommended enactment of such legislation. Prior to the opening of the present Congress, I redrafted my proposal to include two slight modifications suggested by the Commission and invited our colleagues to join with me in seeking early action upon this legislation introduced on January 4. Fifty-one Members of the House have now joined in introducing such measures, many of them identical to H.R. 1180.

The bill before the House today, H.R. 6097, seeks to accomplish the same purpose as the legislation which I have introduced. It has my full support.

It is inconceivable to me that a crime the magnitude of Presidential assassination, affecting as it does the security and welfare of the Nation, is not covered by Federal statutes. Enactment of this legislation would mean that Federal law enforcement officials would investigate these crimes against our highest officials. At present Federal agencies such as the FBI only participate unofficially at the invitation of local authorities. In addition, as the Warren Commission has pointed out, this legislation will insure that any suspects arrested will be Federal prisoners, subject to Federal protection from vigilante justice and other threats.

Present law—18 U.S.C. 111—punishes attacks on many lesser Federal officers by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or imprisonment not more than 3 years, or both; or, if a deadly weapon is used, a fine not exceeding \$10,000 or imprisonment not more than 10 years, or both, on persons convicted of assaulting, resisting, or impeding these Federal officers, while engaged in the performance of official duties; judges; U.S. attorney, assistant U.S. attorney; marshals, deputy marshals, or persons employed to assist such marshal or deputy marshal; any officer or employee of the FBI, Secret Service, Bureau of Narcotics; any post office inspector; any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard; any officer or employee of any Federal penal or correctional institution; any officer, employee, or agent of the customs or internal revenue, or any person assisting the same in the execution of their duties; any immigration officer; any officer, employee, or agent of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to enforce laws pertaining to protection of game, wild birds, and animals; any employee of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary to carry out any law or

regulation, or to perform any function in connection with any Federal or State program of Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, or District of Columbia, for the control, eradication, or prevention of the introduction and dissemination of animal diseases; any officer or employee of the National Park Service, or of the field service of the Bureau of Land Management, or of the Indian field service, or of NASA directed to guard and protect property of the United States under the administration and control of NASA; any employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or any security officer of the Department of State or the Foreign Service—the latter enumeration is contained in 18 U.S.C. 1114.

Under 18 U.S.C. 1114, whoever kills any of the previously enumerated Federal officers and employees shall be punished as provided under 18 U.S.C. 1111—defining murder and imposing penalties of death or imprisonment for life or term of years—or 18 U.S.C. 1112—defining manslaughter and imposing penalties of a fine up to \$1,000 or imprisonment up to 3 years, or both.

Present law does cover threats against the President; 18 U.S.C. 871 provides that whoever knowingly, and willfully mails any letter or document containing any threat to take the life of, or to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, or knowingly and willfully otherwise makes any such threat against the President, shall be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

In addition, assaulting a public minister is covered now by 18 U.S.C. 112 which provides that whoever assaults, strikes, wounds, imprisons, or offers violence to the person of an ambassador or other public minister in violation of the law of nations, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both. If a deadly weapon is used in the commission of such acts, the guilty party shall be fined up to \$10,000, or imprisoned up to 10 years, or both.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on this legislation today. For the benefit of my colleagues I am inserting at this point several editorials which have been written in support of such a measure.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Nov. 27, 1963]

VOIDS THAT NEED FILLING

When Congress resumes its normal deliberations it ought to consider legislation to fill two voids in our governmental procedures and framework which were accentuated by the assassination of President Kennedy.

One is the lack of a firm procedure for decisionmaking concerning the continuity of Government and the transition of leadership in the event a President is seriously incapacitated. What would have happened, for example, if the assassin's bullet had resulted in severe brain damage rather than death?

The problem has been debated before, without conclusion. It has been suggested that some group, such as the Supreme Court, should be duly constituted to make such decisions on the basis, of course, of the best available medical advice. Or that there should be provision for a decision on a temporary transition of the leadership responsibility in the event the incapacity is

June 21, 1965

deemed temporary, as well as on a permanent transition if the incapacity is felt to be permanent. The questions are difficult, but should be faced.

The other void is created by the absence of legislation making it a Federal offense to assault or assassinate the President or the Vice President.

Congressman SCHWEIKER, of Montgomery County, has already introduced legislation to correct this oversight. As things stand now, a number of lesser Federal officials are given the protection of Federal jurisdiction, but procedures governing the trial and the penalty for the assault or assassination of the President or the Vice President are solely determined by the laws of the State in which the crime occurs.

It was this void in our laws which left Lee Harvey Oswald a State, rather than a Federal, prisoner. Inefficient local police work made possible the murder which has deprived the Nation of the possibility of learning the full story of his crime. If the law had made him a Federal prisoner, the outcome would almost surely have been different.

[From the Norristown (Pa.) Times Herald, Nov. 29, 1963]

#### PROTECTING OUR LEADERS

The legislative proposal of Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, that attack upon a President or Vice President shall become a Federal crime, is being well taken throughout the Nation.

Mr. SCHWEIKER has submitted his bill to the House of Representatives. There seems to be no reason for any Member to oppose its passage.

Mr. SCHWEIKER admitted last weekend that he was "amazed," as were all of us, to learn that attack upon many lesser Federal officers is a Federal offense, but that the law does not apply to a President or Vice President. It would seem amazing that some Congressman, throughout all the years of the democracy, did not think this necessary . . . particularly since President Kennedy was not the first of his rank assassinated.

Correction is certainly in order and Mr. SCHWEIKER is to be commended for his leadership toward such correction.

A bill to be offered in the Senate is similar, but would also authorize Federal protection status for Presidents-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect. This may pose problems since those elected are not Federal officers until they are sworn in and inaugurated. It might develop a "loophole."

But the two surely can be fitted together in such a manner that when properly written, there will be full Federal protection for our top commanders.

When the safety of the men in highest rank of our Nation is involved, certainly they deserve our highest and most powerful force of legal protection.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

#### MAKE IT A FEDERAL CRIME

Certainly the law should be amended to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime. It is ironic indeed that the criminal who murdered President Kennedy violated only the law of Texas. Actually his foul deed was a crime against the Nation—one of the most serious crimes against the Nation in this century.

As the law now stands, severe penalties are prescribed for felons who murder or attack Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, FBI agents, postal inspectors, Secret Service officers, customs agents and various employees of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. But this law for the "protection of officers and employees of the United States" does not, strangely enough, cover the President or members of his Cabinet.

Presumably the need for Federal law in this field has not previously been emphasized. When Lincoln was assassinated, the country was still under martial law. The assassin of President Garfield was prosecuted in the District of Columbia and the assassin of President McKinley in New York. There is a strong presumption that Texas would have convicted Lee Harvey Oswald of the slaying of President Kennedy if Oswald himself had not been killed as he was being transferred to the county jail. But the serious bungling of this vital case by the Dallas police constitutes a strong argument for the direction of such delicate operations by the FBI from the very beginning.

The events in Dallas have shown all too clearly that Federal officials should have been in charge of the police work from the beginning. High crimes against the Nation cannot be safely left to investigation and prosecution by local officials of the community in which such crimes happen to take place. As soon as Congress resumes its operations, Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania, will introduce a bill to extend the protection of section 1114, United States Code, to the President and Vice President. We hope that it will be given prompt attention by the Judiciary Committees and that they will also include within the terms of the bill other officials in the line of succession to the Presidency. Perhaps agency heads, their deputies and Members of Congress should also be included.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

#### SCHWEIKER'S BILL A MUST

We hope Congress will act quickly in passing a bill to be drawn up by Congressman RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Montgomery County Republican, making it a Federal crime to kill, assault, or conspire to harm the President or Vice President.

The bizarre slaying of Assassination Suspect Lee Harvey Oswald by a self-appointed executioner points up the need for taking jurisdiction in these cases away from local police.

An attempt, or the actual taking of the life of our Chief Executive or Vice President, is not only of national concern, but also has worldwide repercussions. It is essential that crimes of this nature be covered by Federal law.

We trust that President Johnson's order to the FBI to investigate the slaying of Oswald by nightclub operator Jack Ruby will be thorough and complete. The American conscience calls for it.

[From the Scranton Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

#### PLAN NOT ENTIRELY NEW

The current agitation for the enactment of a law which would give Federal agencies and the Federal courts jurisdiction in the case of the assassination of a President of the United States is not entirely new. Sixty-two years ago, following the death of President McKinley at the hands of an assassin in Buffalo, his successor, Theodore Roosevelt, advocated such a course. He would have had the law apply to any individual who kills or attempts to kill not only the President but "any man who by the Constitution or by law is in line for succession to the Presidency." But the Roosevelt proposal went unheeded.

There is perhaps greater support for the idea today because of some of the unfortunate developments in Dallas following the murder of President Kennedy last month. Many Americans feel that had some agency such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation had the authority to take over immediately, the killing of Lee Oswald, the accused assassin, might never have occurred.

Congressman RICHARD SCHWEIKER, of Penn-

sylvania, has introduced a bill making it a Federal crime to kill, assault or conspire to harm a President of the United States. There is merit and logic in his contention that "a crime of such magnitude, affecting the security and welfare of the Nation, most certainly should be covered by our Federal statutes." It is difficult to believe that the question of States rights will be raised in connection with such a move. Congress should give immediate and favorable consideration to the bill once it is presented and not repeat the mistake which our lawmakers made in rejecting Teddy Roosevelt's recommendation.

#### MR. MARTIN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, we have recently heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, call for the resignation of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, because Mr. Martin in a speech devoted principally to international monetary relations, pointed out some similarities—as well as differences—between current economic conditions and those of the "fabulous twenties." The gentleman from Texas interprets Mr. Martin's remarks as forecasts of a depression, and concludes that Mr. Martin "can not stand prosperity." I can understand how a man who has been predicting a "Martin depression" for some time might leap to this conclusion. But I do not understand why it is all right for the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee to predict a depression, but all wrong for the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to say that we should be careful not to get ourselves into a depression.

The gentleman from Texas has recently informed the House that Mr. Martin is not President Johnson. Since most of us may be presumed to have been aware of that fact, I take it we were expected to draw some kind of inference from it. To help us draw this inference, we were informed that Mr. Martin's "policies run counter to that (sic) of the President of the United States." President Johnson, however, has pointed to the remarkable results achieved by a monetary policy worked out in close harmony with the administration. While the gentleman from Texas calls for elimination of the independence of the Federal Reserve System, President Johnson has noted that his administration has "maintained the Federal Reserve's traditional independence within the Government."

I believe we should keep politics out of monetary policy, and in this case I am happy to indicate my agreement with President Johnson. And I am gratified to see that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, far from calling for Mr. Martin's resignation, are saying he made a good speech.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to include, following my remarks, an editorial from the Washington

Daily News, dated June 17, 1965, entitled "Mr. Martin in Perspective," and a news article from the Washington Evening Star of June 11, 1965, entitled "No Economic Policy Conflicts in Administration: Johnson," and also, a news release from the Office of the White House Press Secretary of October 26, 1964, entitled "Presidential Statement No. 2 on Economic Issues";

[From the Washington Daily News, June 17, 1965]

#### MR. MARTIN IN PERSPECTIVE

After a speech at the National Press Club, the new Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor, was put to answering questions from reporters. Naturally, the first questions were inspired by the recent speech of William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

A phrase in Mr. Martin's speech to the effect that there were some "disquieting similarities" in the economic situations preceding the 1929 stock market crash and today got the most attention—quite out of proportion with the whole of the Fed Chairman's remarks.

The ensuing slump in the stock market was blamed by some on this speech and there even were cries in Congress for Mr. Martin's resignation because, it was said, his policies were counter to those of President Johnson.

Mr. Connor put all this back in perspective. Mr. Martin's speech, the Secretary said, was a timely and sound review of current conditions, throwing up some "smoke" signals to warn of possible dangers, but primarily aimed at the problem of U.S. deficits in our dealings with other nations. The trouble, Mr. Connor said, was that too many people didn't read all of the speech (including, we suggest, many who reported it).

Mr. Connor threw up a few "smoke signals" himself. He said the main virtue of the current prosperity is that it is the result of orderly growth and price stability. If this growth should become haphazard, or reckless, or excessive, he indicated, it could spell trouble. As could inflation.

And he, too, pointed to the imbalance in our international dealing as an unsolved problem, urgently in need of correction.

He also deflated the idea that the stock market slump could be attributed to Mr. Martin's remarks. He suggested it was on the verge of a decline anyway, possibly because some investors simply were suspicious that the continued rising trends were too good to be true.

In any case, we would add, if the stock market is so frivolous that it would slide merely because of distorted understanding of what one public official had said, it is a pretty flimsy institution. Or more emotional than hardheaded.

Moreover, if the market didn't fluctuate there wouldn't be much point in it. And it can't realistically, forever fluctuate upward. There necessarily must be corrective declines.

The stock market isn't the whole economy, and being largely speculative doesn't necessarily reflect the state of the economy. Take, for instance, a smalltown Nebraska banker quoted in the Wall Street Journal:

"We are so overcome with joy with the extreme rise in the livestock market that we've paid little attention to the price of A.T. & T. Our economy out here is based on hogs and cattle."

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 11, 1965]

#### NO ECONOMIC POLICY CONFLICTS IN ADMINISTRATION: JOHNSON

WASHINGTON, June 11.—President Johnson has muffled speculation over a governmental split in his economic policy by giving assur-

ances that there are "no crosscurrents, divisions, or conflicts" within the administration.

The President told reporters after a meeting with William M. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and other top economic officials yesterday, that moderate but solid gains are foreseeable through 1965. "There is no reason for gloom or doom," he said.

This was an apparent reference to the stock market slump and public furor which followed Martin's June 1 speech at Columbia University.

That was the speech in which Martin spoke of "disquieting similarities between our present prosperity and the fabulous twenties," and emphasized the role of monetary policy—management of the money and credit supply—in preventing possible inflationary excesses.

#### RESIGNATION ASKED

Martin's resignation was demanded yesterday by Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Banking Committee. PATMAN charged that Martin had challenged Mr. Johnson's economic policy and was calling for what PATMAN described as a disastrous policy of tight money.

"This country cannot afford, even as prosperous as it is, a man at the helm of our monetary system who is so afraid of prosperity that he has to end it," PATMAN said on the House floor.

But Treasury Secretary Fowler, in an interview given before the White House meeting, helped Mr. Johnson quash the talk of a policy split on the issue of tight money versus expansionism.

Fowler said he and Commerce Secretary Connor agreed completely with what they regarded as Martin's basic theme, that of maintaining and strengthening the soundness of the dollar.

#### NO INDIGESTION

"The speech caused me no nervous indigestion," Fowler said. "I was surprised at the stock market's reaction, and I think Bill Martin was too."

The market slump was caused by investors' fears that Martin was hinting at a coming move to tighten money by boosting interest rates, Fowler said. He himself had read no such meaning into Martin's talk "because I know Bill's thinking."

After the White House meeting, Martin smilingly indicated he had no intention of taking Representative PATMAN's advice and resigning. "When and if I desire to resign I'll let you know," said the man who has headed the Reserve Board under four Presidents.

#### MONETARY POLICY FOR STABILITY AND GROWTH (The White House, Presidential Statement No. 2 on Economic Issues)

1. Monetary policy is one of our crucially important tools for maintaining a healthy and noninflationary economy. The job is never easy. But the results over the past 4 years have been remarkable:

Ample but not excessive credit has been available to businesses, homebuyers, and State and local governments.

At the same time, short-term interest rates have been pushed up to reduce capital outflows and help correct our balance-of-payments deficit.

Yet long-term interest rates, which are so important to domestic borrowers, have remained moderate—in fact, home mortgage rates and the rates paid by State and local governments are lower today than in early 1961.

2. All this has been made possible by close ties between our monetary and our fiscal and debt management policies, and close harmony among the men responsible for these policies.

We have maintained the Federal Reserve's traditional independence within the Government.

Yet the Federal Reserve and the administration agree entirely on the practical need for informal coordination among the various economic programs of the Government.

The President meets periodically with a group consisting of Secretary Dillon, Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, Budget Director Gordon, and Chairman Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers, and they in turn are in close and continuous contact.

These efforts have resulted in Government by consensus, not by conflict, in economic policy.

3. In the future as in the past, our monetary system must remain flexible, and not be bound by any rigid, mechanical rules:

In an atmosphere of private and public moderation, monetary policy has been steadily expansionary for 4 years.

With continued moderation, there can be the continued monetary expansion essential to economic growth.

But if inflation develops, or if excessive outflows of funds occur, the Federal Reserve System is in a position to do what is necessary.

#### PROVIDING PENALTIES FOR THE ASSASSINATION OF THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for passage of the measure we are now considering. The bill H.R. 6097 would provide the proper penalties for crimes against the President and Vice President, the President-elect and Vice-President-elect, and those acting as and in line to succeed the President.

Our Government could not take swift steps to cope with the tragic events of November 23, 1963, because of the lack of necessary legislative authority at the Federal level. Those apprehended were inadequately protected and the Federal enforcement agencies almost powerless to initiate proceedings.

Immediately thereafter, I submitted a bill, providing for Federal jurisdiction over cases of assault or assassination of our head of state and officials of comparable rank. Recommendations for such remedy were set forth subsequently in the Warren Commission report. Early in the current session, I reintroduced my proposal and spoke in its favor both in the House Chamber and before the Judiciary Committee at their recent hearings.

Our inability to meet what rightly constitutes a Federal crime with Federal statutes is incongruous and incredible. We cannot afford to pass up this opportunity to fill a blatant omission in our Federal laws.

(Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HORTON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]



June 21, 1965

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. TALCOTT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

#### CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 147 which was just taken, I was present in the well and answered to my name when it was called and voted "yea." I am informed that I am not recorded as having voted "yea" and ask unanimous consent that the rollcall be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform my colleagues as to an item, Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, to be added to the legislative program.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has obtained unanimous consent, and I see the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] on the floor, and I understand this has been cleared with both sides, to call up the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, having to do with the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, with debate of 1 hour thereon.

Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution will be programed along with other bills that have been programed for Tuesday and the balance of the week, the resolution to be taken up depending on whatever day it will be possible to program it for consideration, probably tomorrow or Thursday. It is necessary to have some flexibility on that point if it is agreeable.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. That is with the understanding that there will be 1 hour of debate on the resolution and that the resolution would be amendable?

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding. It would be called up under unanimous consent and it will be debated for 1 hour.

Mr. GROSS. And it will be amendable?

Mr. ALBERT. It will be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As to the 1 hour of time for debate, would the time be equally divided between the majority and the minority?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman. At least that is my understanding.

#### FREEDOM FROM DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Chairman ADAM C. POWELL, joined by 15 other Democratic members of the Committee on Education and Labor, has today introduced a bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or natural origin. The point of the bill is, in the light of other recent legislation, to be sure that the rights of all groups will be assured with respect to freedom from discrimination in employment opportunities, especially since many members last year expressed the concern that in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, title VII enforcement proceedings are not strong enough to meet the problem of discrimination by employers or unions once it has been found to exist. It is felt that the Congress may now wish to act to assure that the matter of discrimination in employment opportunities will be handled in an expeditious manner.

Therefore, hearings by the General Subcommittee on Labor will be scheduled at the earliest possible time, taking into account the necessity of testimony from the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission regarding its recommendations and comments on the existing law.

The subcommittee will then take the matter to the full committee forthwith in recognition of the urgency of this matter.

My colleagues may be assured that this matter will be handled by the full committee with all due regard for its high responsibility for legislation, and I am delighted to note that so many of my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor have followed Chairman POWELL'S vigorous leadership in this respect.

#### OPPRESSION OF THE BALTIC STATES BY RUSSIA

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to plead for the freedom of people. In an age in which freedom exists everywhere around us, it is depressing and disturbing to discover that not all nations are free. We are aware of this problem in our own country, but we often neglect to admit that it exists in other places throughout the world.

I wish to say a few words about those unfortunate people who have lost their freedom because of oppression by the Soviet Union. I speak specifically about the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Despite treaties to the contrary, in 1940 the Soviet Union occupied these three territories with military troops and forcibly incorporated them into the U.S.S.R.

Since that time, the Soviet Union underwent mass oppression of these unfortunate people. No countries have had such persecution, and such degrad-

ing oppression. More than 1 million persons have been victims to this Soviet brutality.

This is an age when nations throughout the world are freeing their colonies and possessions from iron-bound subservience. The force of world opinion should be turned against the Soviet Government so that we can, in our lifetime, see an end to Communist colonialism throughout the world. It has been 25 years since the Soviets have occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. A quarter of a century is too long, and I appeal to all men to join in efforts being taken in this infamous anniversary year to bring an end to this unfortunate situation.

#### TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF FORCIBLE ANNEXATION OF BALTIC STATES BY SOVIET UNION

(Mr. STALBAUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the forcible annexation of Baltic States by the Soviet Union was observed in Racine, Wis., my hometown, on June 6 at St. Casimir's Hall under the sponsorship of the Lithuanian American Council Inc., Racine branch.

At that time, a resolution was unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent.

H.R. 416 which is scheduled to be considered by us later today closely parallels this resolution unanimously adopted by my friends in Racine. It advocates efforts by the President and the Congress to bring the plight of the peoples of the enslaved countries before the United Nations.

The Racine resolution also voices support of the present policy of President Lyndon B. Johnson of resisting Communist aggression in southeast Asia and also expresses thanks for this Nation's nonrecognition of the absorption of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the circle of Communist control.

The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas 25 years ago the Soviet Union by force and fake elections annexed the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and

Whereas the Baltic countries are being colonized by import of Russians, most of whom are Communists or criminals, and who receive various privileges at the expense of the Baltic people; and

Whereas pauperization of the people of these countries is carried out by state-run facilities which mostly serve the purposes of the Russian rulers; and

Whereas the persecution of the faithful and restriction of religious practices are strictly imposed; and

Whereas our young men sacrificed their lives in the past and are sacrificing them in the struggle with the same foe which brought tyranny and misery to the Baltic States and to many other countries; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting condemns Soviet Russia for its forcible occupation of the Baltic States and also its former and present policy of colonialism and oppression; and be it further